

Attorney Docket No. 129.461.1008

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Ex.: Deanna K. Hall

Art Unit: 3767

OK TO ENTER: /DKH/

7/9/08

Applicant:

Arnold R. Leiboff

Serial No.:

10/702,303

Confirmation No.:

8007

Filed:

November 6, 2003

For:

# GUIDEWIRE FOR USE IN COLONIC IRRIGATION

Customer No.:

22846

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116**

MAIL STOP With Fee Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

June 19, 2008

S I R :

In response to the Office Action mailed February 19, 2008, the extended term for response to which expires on June 19, 2008, applicant comments as follows:

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 102/103

Claims 1-3, 7-20, 23-25, 29 and 30 were rejected in view of Leiboff (U.S. Pat. No. 4,637,814) and Majlessi (U.S. Pat. No. 4,842,583), and claims 4-6, 21, 22 and 26-28 were rejected in view of Leiboff, Majlessi and Stevens (U.S. Pat. No. 4,811,743).

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed for two reasons: 1) it would not have been obvious to modify Leiboff in view of Majlessi and Stevens and arrive at the embodiments of the invention set forth in claims 1-6 and 23-28; and 2) the cited prior art does not disclose all of the features of claims 7-22, 29 and 20.

Obviousness Argument (claims 1-6 and 23-28)

It would not have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made "to have modified the device